



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,856	10/17/2003	Andreas Roessler	09700.0056-00	9457

60668	7590	12/13/2007
SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW		
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413		

EXAMINER	
PHANTANA ANGKOOL, DAVID	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/688,856	Applicant(s) ROESSLER, ANDREAS	
	Examiner David Phantana-angkool	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed on September 14th, 2007. **This action is made final.**
2. Claims 1-14 are pending claims.
3. Applicants amended claims 1, 6, 7, 13.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 9 is objected to because of the phrase "the data structure" lacks clear antecedent.
Appropriate correction is required

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
6. **Claims 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

As for independent claims 7 and 13:

Although the applicant appears to attempt to claim statutory subject matter (an apparatus and a system), the claims appear to lack any structural or statutory elements at this time. All the claims appear to be software per se. For example claim 13 recites "a filtering mechanism", the filtering mechanism resides within a web browser (see Fig. 4# 140 in applicant's drawings and Pg. 3, lines 21-28 of the specification), which is software per se.

As for dependent claims 8-12 and 14:

The claims are rejected as not overcoming the deficiency of the claim(s) from which they depends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lupo et al., US# 6,973,625 B1 (hereinafter Lupo).

As for independent claim 1:

Lupo shows a computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, the computer program product comprising instructions operable to cause data processing apparatus to perform operations comprising:

- *detecting multiple changes to a user interface of a computer program, the user interface having multiple user interface elements, each change being a change to one of the multiple user interface elements (3: 54-4: 11);*
- *generating a rendering request for each change, each rendering request specifying the user interface element that has changed and a type of modification to be performed on the user interface element; filtering the rendering requests to eliminate redundant rendering requests [4: 52 - 5:7 and 5: 23-34, Lupo shows the system renders certain graphical elements based from the request user input, and therefore the system eliminates rendering unnecessary information.*

Based on the user inputs, the system filters what certain graphical elements it to be displayed.

Lupo disclosed the following in Column 5, lines 28-34:

"the framework may disable the submit button until after the user has entered or selected all required information; make parts of the screen invisible until the user selects a specific check box or radio button, so that the user doesn't waste time entering unnecessary

information; and/or run a customized function based on the application's state management requirements" (emphasis added)].

Thus Lupo shows all the limitations in claim 1 and the following: *filtering the rendering requests to eliminate redundant rendering requests*

As for dependent claim 2:

Lupo shows *the product of claim 1, wherein each rendering request is a request to modify a data structure representing the user interface (5:40-49).*

As for dependent claim 3:

Lupo shows *the product of claim 2, wherein the data structure is a document object model representation of the user interface (5:40-49).*

As for dependent claim 4:

Lupo shows *the product of claim 1, wherein: the type of modification is a complete re-rendering of the user interface element (2: 44-64 and 5:23-34).*

As for dependent claim 5:

Lupo shows *the product of claim 1, wherein: the type of modification is an update of one or more, but not all, of the attributes of the user interface element (2: 44-64 and 5:23-34).*

As for dependent claim 6:

Lupo shows *the product of claim 1, wherein the operations further comprise: rendering the user interface based on the filtered rendering requests (5: 23-34 and 5: 40-49).*

As for claims 7-12:

Claims 7-12 reflect the apparatus comprising of computer readable instructions for performing the step of claims 1-6 and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for dependent claim 13:

Lupo shows a system comprising:

- a Web page rendered in a Web browser, the Web page including one or more user interface elements; a document object model representation of the Web page, and a framework running in the browser, the framework including (3:62-4: 11):
 - one or more trees that store the visualization of the Web page, each user interface element being associated with a portion of the document object model representation and with a portion of the tree (6:29-40);
 - a filtering mechanism for filtering redundant rendering requests, each rendering request specifying a user interface element that has changed and a type of modification to be performed on the portion of the document object model representation associated with the specified user interface element [4: 52-5:7 and 5: 23-34, Lupo shows the system renders certain graphical elements based from the request user input, and therefore the system eliminates rendering unnecessary information. Based on the user inputs, the system filters what certain graphical elements it to be displayed. Lupo disclosed the following in Column 5, lines 28-34:

"the framework may disable the submit button until after the user has entered or selected all required information; make parts of the screen invisible until the user selects a specific check box or radio button, so that the user doesn't waste time entering unnecessary information; and/or run a customized function based on the application's state management requirements" (emphasis added)].

Thus Lupo shows all the limitations in claim 13.

As for dependent claim 14:

Lupo shows the system of claim 13, wherein the trees include a UI tree, a data tree, or both (5: 50- 6: 15).

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-

33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

The Examiner notes MPEP § 2144.01, that quotes *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825,159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968) as stating "in considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." Further MPEP 2123, states that "a reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 09/14/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner refers applicants to MPEP 2123 and the last Office Action mailed on 07/05/07 Pgs. 4 and 5, where the Office Action states the entire reference is cited and specific cited sections of the reference are not limiting in any way. Any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. *In re Heck*, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d

10. Applicant argues *Lupo does not disclose each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention*. Applicant further argues *Lupo does not disclose... "filtering the requests to eliminate redundant rendering requests* (Applicant's Remarks, Pg. 7)

The Office respectfully disagrees.

Lupo shows the all the limitations of claim 1 as shown above in the Office Action on Pgs. 2 and 3.

Lupo shows a computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, the computer program product comprising instructions operable to cause data processing apparatus to perform operations comprising:

- *detecting multiple changes to a user interface of a computer program, the user interface having multiple user interface elements, each change being a change to one of the multiple user interface elements (3: 54-4: 11);*
- *generating a rendering request for each change, each rendering request specifying the user interface element that has changed and a type of modification to be performed on the user interface element; filtering the rendering requests to eliminate redundant rendering requests [4: 52 - 5:7 and 5: 23-34, Lupo shows the system renders certain graphical elements based from the request user input, and therefore the system eliminates rendering unnecessary information.*

Based on the user inputs, the system filters what certain graphical elements it to be displayed.

Lupo disclosed the following in Column 5, lines 28-34:

"the framework may disable the submit button until after the user has entered or selected all required information; make parts of the screen invisible until the user selects a specific check box or radio button, so that the user doesn't waste time entering unnecessary information; and/or run a customized function based on the application's state management requirements" (emphasis added)).

From the evidence set forth above Lupo shows all the limitations of claim 1 including the limitation: ; *filtering the rendering requests to eliminate redundant rendering requests.*

11. Applicant asserts *By way of example, Applicant discloses at page 4 of the specification that "[a] redundant request is a request that is identical to or a subset of another request." Lupo discloses no rendering request that is "identical to or a subset of another request." Therefore, Lupo fails to teach or suggest the claimed "filtering the requests to eliminate redundant rendering requests," as recited by independent claim 1 (Applicant's Remarks, Pg. 7).*

The Office respectfully disagrees.

Regarding Lupo not disclosing a *rendering request that is "identical to or a subset of another request"*, the Applicant is merely arguing what the Applicant's Specification defines *redundant rendering request* as (As stated by the Applicant above and Pg. 4 of the specification). Nowhere in claim 1 mentions *rendering request that is "identical to or a subset of another request"*. If the Applicant wishes to have *rendering request that is "identical to or a subset of another request"*, then the Applicant should recite the following: *rendering request that is "identical to or a subset of another request"* in the claims and not: *rendering request*.

12. Applicant argues Lupo does not anticipate or render obvious independent claims 7 and 13 for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with the recitations of claim 1.

The Office respectfully disagrees.

The Office shows that Lupo teaches all the limitations in claim 1 as shown above. Since claims 7 and 13 contain similar subject matter as claim 1, claims 7 and 13 are rejected along the same rationale as claim 1.

13. Applicant argues *Lupo does not indicate whether the changes to the web page are reflected by a complete re-rendering of a user interface, or by re-rendering individual attributes. Therefore, Lupo does no teach or suggest the claimed "wherein the type of modification is a complete re-rendering of the user interface element."* (Applicant's Remarks, Pg. 8).

The Office respectfully disagrees.

Lupo shows the product of claim 1, wherein: the type of modification is a complete re-rendering of the user interface element (2: 44-64 and 5:23-34).

Lupo disclosed the following in Column 5, lines 28-34:

"the framework may disable the submit button until after the user has entered or selected all required information; make parts of the screen invisible until the user selects a specific check box or radio button, so that the user doesn't waste time entering unnecessary information; and/or run a customized function based on the application's state management requirements" (emphasis added).

From the evidence set forth above Lupo shows all the limitation of claim 4.

14. Applicant argues Lupo does not teach or suggest the claimed "the type of modification is an update of one or more, but not all, of the attributes of the user interface element."

The Office respectfully disagrees.

Lupo disclosed the following in Column 5, lines 28-34:

"the framework may disable the submit button until after the user has entered or selected all required information; make parts of the screen invisible until the user selects a specific check box or radio button, so that the user doesn't waste time entering unnecessary information; and/or run a customized function based on the application's state management requirements" (emphasis added).

From the evidence set forth above Lupo shows all the limitation of claim 4.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Phantana-angkool whose telephone number is 571-272-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30 PM.


Application/Control Number:
10/688,856
Art Unit: 2179

Page 10

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DP


WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER